



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

dred and sixty million pounds that in this country go every year in drink? And was not Dr. Johnson fundamentally right when he said, "Sir, the reason why a man drinks is that he is not interesting enough to himself to pass his leisure time without it"?

As we have seen, it is an error to suppose that these interests are only for a cloistered caste, distinct and divided from society at large. They are implied in and permeate all social life and are its quintessence. They are not artificial, or imposed upon the social whole *ab extra*, but spring out of its nature. Take the mere phrase, 'Learning to read.' How many meanings it may bear! I remember a severe critic once observing that our circulating libraries act as middlemen between writers who do not know how to write and readers who do not know how to read. What a thing it would be if the children who pass through our schools had 'learned *to read*,' in the sense in which the critic meant that our novel-reading public had not. To read, that is, for their own enjoyment, things worth reading. Grant, if we like, that Aristotle throws his *desideratum* too much into the form of philosophy and theology. Both of these exist, and Aristotle knew it well, in the more accessible forms of poetry and religion. And these at least are universal possessions, and no class in a modern state need be excluded from participating through them in the supreme spiritual activity.

LONDON.

B. BOSANQUET.

## CHARITY ORGANIZATION.

THOMAS JONES.

DR. BOSANQUET does not "at all recognize the portrait of the Charity Organization movement in its relation to the Poor Law" which I outlined in the January (1910) number of the JOURNAL. It was not my purpose to draw a full-length portrait of the C. O. S., still

less of the Charity Organization movement. That I am not quite blind to the good features of the C. O. S. I can perhaps best prove by quoting from an article which I wrote on the appearance of the Majority Report:

For forty years the C. O. S.,—to use the familiar letters,—has stood for a worthy if austere ideal of coöperative help. It has said that treatment should follow investigation; that both should be thorough, and that the aim of building up character should ever be kept in view. It has faithfully proclaimed the evils of overlapping, and exposed imposture. And it is not true to say that it has been content with mere negation. It has held a long series of inquiries into housing, vagrancy, emigration, exceptional distress, and unskilled labor, and published valuable reports thereon. It has thrown off from the parent stock societies like the Invalid Children's Aid Society and the Association for the Care of the Feeble-Minded. Quite recently it has founded a School of Sociology. Nor is it a valid criticism to say that the relief it dispenses is relatively small. If it never had spent a penny on relief, its existence would still have been fully justified. It was not intended to be an additional relieving agency, but the organizer of those already existing. So long as we admit it to be desirable to distribute charity to the poor, it follows that there should be method in our benevolence. Much of the abuse leveled at the C. O. S. is therefore beside the mark. Of course, kind souls like Charles Lamb, who give and ask no questions, and who find in the fluttering tatters of mendicancy the graceful insignia of a picturesque profession, are naturally incensed by a society "which rakes the bowels of unwelcome truth to save a half-penny." Those, however, who believe in social order and denounce the anarchy of competition should be the first to recognize the value of organization in this as in other spheres.

Secondly, Dr. Bosanquet maintains that there is "a wholly unwarranted suggestion" in my remark that "the Majority have traveled far from the position of past years." This seems to be a misreading of the following sentence: "It is highly satisfactory to find that in their proposals for dealing with children the Majority have traveled far from the practice of past years" (p. 193). With this Dr. Bosanquet would, perhaps, agree. But, apart from this special point, he holds that, generally, I exaggerate the advance which the Majority Report shows on the position taken up by the C. O. S. This is admittedly a question of degree. To me the advance seems considerable in several directions. The reader could realize its extent only by a perusal of the volumes of "Occa-

sional Papers” and by personal contact with the average C. O. S. worker *before* the appearance of the Majority Report. As this is not practicable, a few illustrations will indicate the direction the advance has taken.

1. The analysis of the causes of pauperism contained in the Majority Report, while never failing to emphasize ‘moral causes,’ in the proper C. O. S. manner, grants to economic influences a more prominent place than has been customary in C. O. S. literature. Among the general principles acknowledged in both reports is “the necessity of recognizing industrial conditions as responsible for a large, perhaps the largest, part of modern poverty.” I do not know whether the Majority would accept this summary of their views by Professor Muirhead,<sup>2</sup> but, at any rate, the new accent is unmistakable. We shall hear less in future of ‘the expansion of trade’ as a cure for unemployment, less of the ‘burden of rates and taxes’ as a cause of unemployment, and instead of casual labor appearing at the end of a list of causes, it will appear near the beginning. Despite an obvious desire to lean to virtue’s side, the Majority put forward ‘Administration’ as a cause with at least a show of hesitation and caution to which the orthodox charity organizer is a complete stranger. Here are a few characteristic utterances of the latter:

Out-relief is the chief cause of pauperism, and accounts for four-fifths of the pauperism of this country, drunkenness and crime contributing very little to it. (T. Bland Garland.)

Nine-tenths of the poor law applicants are created by the system, and if it was not for the system, those people would not have existed in their present condition at all. (W. Vallance.)

But the great and moving causes of pauperism are, after all said, bad administration of public relief and indiscriminate charity. (Sir William Chance.)

2. The view of the Poor Law as having a positive function with curative and restorative powers is more conspicuous in the pages of the Majority Report than in

---

<sup>2</sup> “By What Authority.”

C. O. S. publications. One can easily imagine the amazement of some leading charity organizers when they found the Majority declaring that "what is wanted is not to abolish the Poor Law, but to widen, strengthen, and humanize the Poor Law, so as to make it respond to a demand for a more considerate, elastic, and so far as possible, curative treatment of the able-bodied" (Part VI, Sec. 337). This is certainly a departure from the doctrine of some leading charity organizers whose favorite maxim has been "The Poor Law should be machine-like," or "The administration of the Poor Law is a matter of police," and who have sometimes wished "that the English law could be assimilated to the Scotch law in the matter of relief to the able-bodied, at any rate for times of exceptional distress."<sup>3</sup> In what I called the traditional text-books even the boarding-out system for children was regarded as contrary to "any sound principles of Poor Law" and its adoption denounced as "striking evidence that there is a danger of the country at any moment returning to some of the worst evils of the old Poor Law."<sup>4</sup> Again, Mr. Mackay once described medical relief as "the first step in the descent to the Avernus of pauperism." Now we have the Majority recommending what in the opinion of Dr. Downes "amounts to a large measure of free medical relief."

3. But we need not go beyond the quite recent history of the C. O. S. itself to find abundant proof that leading charity organizers themselves think the Majority Report a considerable and even dangerous advance on orthodox principles. In December last at a meeting of the C. O. S. Council there was a full-dress debate on the Poor Law Report and Voluntary Charity at which Dr. Bosanquet defended the position taken up by the Majority against the attack of several redoubtable charity organizers. It was, *e. g.*, Sir Arthur Clay's firm conviction that if the

---

<sup>3</sup> "Occasional Papers," 1905, p. 167.

<sup>4</sup> Fawcett, "Pauperism," p. 79; Fowle, "Poor Law," p. 144.

recommendations of the Majority *re* voluntary aid were carried into effect "the C. O. S. would perish, stifled and strangled by official regulations." Mr. Crowder, the Nestor of the strict school, declared that the "scheme before them was utterly unworkable; it confused hopelessly the functions of Poor Law and charity; public assistance was to be made far easier to obtain, and the people of this country were to be rapidly demoralized."<sup>5</sup> Similarly another well-known charity organizer, the Rev. P. S. G. Propert, fulminates as follows:

The proposals of the majority, if carried out in their entirety, would convert the State into a vast organizer of charity, and would, I believe, lead to the wasteful expenditure of millions of money, and the impoverishment not only of the treasury but of the national character.<sup>6</sup>

Whether these fears are justified or not is not here relevant. What is plain, and to me gratifying, is that the C. O. S. members of the Commission have signed a report which goes some distance toward municipalizing the movement, and that there are signs that, given ample time, the society may travel still further in the direction of the Minority Report. Colonel Bethell, at the Council meeting referred to, could not see any vital distinction between the Public Assistance Authority and the Voluntary Aid Councils. What need, he asked, was made out for the latter at all? Why not give the former enough public money to do thoroughly all that it found necessary? In a similar sense the South West House Committee reported to the Council that in its opinion voluntary agencies should be gradually subordinated to official ones. Most astonishing sentiments these to be promulgated in Denison House!

But I need not go on multiplying illustrations, for Dr. Bosanquet will doubtless brush them all aside as merely "incidental views on matters of current policy" in no way inconsistent with his theory of pauperism, pure and

---

<sup>5</sup>"C. O. S. Review," December, 1909, and January, 1910.

<sup>6</sup>"Via Tertia," p. 84.

undefiled. But at least these 'incidental views' do in fact imply a criticism of the way in which that theory has been held in the past and a measure of the departure of the Majority from what that theory was supposed to be. The truth is there are welcome signs,—more signs than I have indicated,—within the society itself and its immediate sphere of influence, of impatience with its analysis of social dependence. And this dissatisfaction has shown itself not only in the founding of offshoots like the Councils of Public Welfare (not too eager to avow their parentage), but in that failure of the society to attract new workers bewailed by a charity organizer in the *Quarterly Review*:

A few years ago most young men who came up from the universities to social work in London joined charity organization committees almost as a matter of course in order to learn their work. Now it would be hardly unfair to say that they come up from Oxford or Cambridge with their minds made up upon social questions, and that they consider the teaching of the Society as antiquated and obsolete. . . . The late Duke of Westminster, a constant friend, and at one time an active worker for the Society, spoke many years ago at a meeting over which he presided of the "noble work done for the Society by the young officers of the Guards." There are no young officers of the Guards now working for the Society.<sup>7</sup>

Dr. Bosanquet has given us an admirable statement of the theory of pauperism animating the C. O. S. for which your readers will be grateful, and I am glad I provoked him into writing it. Attired in its philosophical garb I imagine many supporters of the Minority Report could almost accept it as their own. But cross-examination would soon reveal that though the words used were the same, the meaning would be different. The objects of the Minority, as of the charity organization movement, is "the prevention of pauperism by every possible arrangement, adjustment, and contrivance, positive and negative, which can be shown to make for the strengthening of the citizen mind, and the improvement of the condition of the poor, which it counts as the material

---

<sup>7</sup> *Quarterly Review*, January, 1907, p. 76.

equivalent of the former." There is, however, a broad difference of emphasis on state and private action. If in certain provinces the minority prefer legal regulation and compulsion to information and suggestion, it is because they believe that a far greater preventive force is generated by this method. Let me indicate briefly some of the main changes in interpretation, in stress, and in practical application which the theory of pauperism as set out by Dr. Bosanquet would undergo at the hands of one who approached the problem from the Minority's standpoint.

1. The theory starts with the idea of democratic citizenship. Citizens are equal and independent. "There is no presumption of special dependence between class and class or person and person, except within the family." The independent citizen, like the economic man, is doubtless a useful hypothesis, but the wholesome thing to do when one hears of him is to make a bee-line to reality through the pages, say, of Mr. Wallas's "Human Nature in Politics," or Miss Rathbone's "How the Casual Labourer Lives." As things are to-day in the lives of most casual laborers, for example, there is a presumption of special dependence upon the pawnbroker or the money lender or charity or all three. For many of those born of inferior stocks at the casual level, ill-housed, ill-nourished, and ill-trained, the presumption is that they will grow up into economic and political parasites, and so long as the conditions surrounding the birth of this not inconsiderable class continue, neither coöperative societies nor trade unions, neither friendly societies nor savings banks, will flourish in their midst, and charity organizers will never be unemployed. "Modern practice recognizes the right of every man to life and liberty. Socially it refuses to tolerate slavery; politically, it refuses to exclude the laborer from a vote. One thing it does not do,—while recognizing the right of every man to life and liberty, it does not make it real. . . . We do not attempt to see to it that each man *shall* have the func-

tion, the work, which is the positive side of his freedom. 'While we say that he shall not be used as a means, we often leave him without the chance of using himself for any social end at all.'"<sup>8</sup> So with women. As things are there is a presumption that a large number of women, and especially widows, of the wage-earning class, will become dependent upon the state or upon persons outside the family, or upon wages which are barely adequate for the decent maintenance of one person and inadequate for the maintenance of more than one. "Marriage," Miss Hutchins tells us, "may be supposed at best (granting that all wives are supported by their husbands) to provide for about three-fourths of women, but for twenty years only, between thirty-five and fifty-five. Before thirty-five and after fifty-five a very large proportion are not thus provided for. Some are, of course, maintained by brother, parent or other relation; but whatever theories we may hold about 'economic independence,' it is evident that for a large number of women 'economic self-dependence' is nothing but a stern necessity."<sup>9</sup> Of the children receiving poor relief over ninety thousand are children of able-bodied widows relieved.

The word 'independent' deserves a paragraph all to itself. It is used in quite misleading ways by several charity organizers. Sometimes it means, as with Dr. Bosanquet, ability 'to face the situation'; at other times it simply means non-dependence on the Poor Law and frequently there is an illegitimate suggestion that the two senses are identical.

During the last twenty-five years the people of England have year by year become more independent. Those who in the judgment of the guardians require necessary relief from the rates are become fewer. (C. S. Loch, 1894.)

Now, if it can be proved possible to dispauperize, *i. e.*, diminish pauperism, and thereby render a larger section of the people independent, this dereliction of duty is of the gravest moment, for it concerns not this generation alone, but successive generations yet unborn; it is, in fact, a

---

<sup>8</sup> Barker, "Plato and Aristotle," p. 372.

<sup>9</sup> *Journal of the Statistical Society*, June, 1909.

standing hindrance to the economic progress of the people. (T. Mackay, 1903.)

It is quite possible that a decrease in technical pauperism may coincide with a decrease in pauperism in the bad sense of being 'unequal to the situation,' but it by no means follows. On behalf of the recent commission Miss G. Harlock visited forty-nine cases,—chiefly in carefully administered unions,—in which out-relief had been refused. She summarizes the result as follows.

1. In no case was the support by relatives increased through the refusal of out-relief.

2. In no case has any charitable agency effectively dealt with the destitution.

3. There was no evidence to show that the applicants themselves had been stimulated by the refusal of relief to greater personal efforts.

4. Two of the cases found work.

5. In more than half of the cases the refusal of out-relief led to a gradual dispersal of the household furniture and wearing apparel, often not even excepting the most necessary clothing. There were also unmistakable signs of a marked physical deterioration of the members of the families, owing to lack of food, warmth and proper clothing. If eventually the applicants are forced to enter the workhouse, they will do so with health gone, home gone, and spirit and courage shattered. The deterioration is, from the national standpoint, probably most serious in the case of the children. The homes which were being broken up were of two classes: firstly, respectable homes, which have been in the past thoroughly comfortable; secondly, homes which possibly have never reached a high standard of comfort.

6. Six of the applicants accepted the order for the workhouse.<sup>10</sup>

With the exception of the six who entered the workhouse, the remainder, in the euphemistic phrase of the strict administrator, "floated off and became independent." Repression alters the statistics, but it does not alter the facts. Distress is redistributed rather than removed, at any rate in large urban centers.<sup>11</sup> Protesting against

---

<sup>10</sup> Report on Refusal of Out-relief, by Miss G. Harlock. Vol. XXI, p. 37. Cf. Vol. XVII, pp. 505-517, for other examples.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Martley's "Statement of Evidence," Vol. VIII, p. 194. Cf. Dr. Cannan's protest in the *Clare Market Review* (October, 1906) against Dr. Loch's handling of pauper statistics: "Pauperism in the technical sense is the antidote, homeopathic if you will, but still the antidote, against

the Majority's account of the out-relief cases, Dr. Downes naïvely maintains that "the conditions of life of the outdoor paupers described are certainly no worse than those of the neighboring independent people of the poorest class."

2. "What I want to know," writes Dr. Bosanquet, "is how he, being now obviously weak in the citizen or social mind (it is the same thing) may be made strong, and how others may be prevented from weakening." I agree; we all want to support or to restore the citizen mind. But some of us think that English charity organizers<sup>12</sup> underestimate the power of economic conditions to manufacture and perpetuate civic weakness just as their opponents are apt to belittle the power of mind to shape adverse circumstances to advantage. "It is a conservative statement to say," writes Professor Devine, of the New York C. O. S., that there are "hundreds of thousands whose industrial inefficiency is due to the fact that from infancy to manhood their lives have been cast in unwholesome, physically destructive conditions." If you confront an English charity organizer with that statement he will probably reply, "A man's circumstances depend upon what he himself is," which is a half or some other fractional truth. Why is he what he is? The case expert, rightly careful of detail, suffers from myopia when he deals with the adult applicant and does not allow for the operation of predisposing causes of social failure,—heredity, poverty, ignorance,—back of the immediately exciting causes like drink or laziness. Hence the natural suggestion that sobriety and industry would remove our social ills. "Patience, labor, sobriety, frugality and religion should be recommended to them; all the rest is

---

pauperism in the bad sense. To rejoice over a decrease of legal poor relief without considering the magnitude of pauperism in the bad sense is wrong, and it is annoying to find Mr. Loch speaking as if the transference of population from the country, where poor relief is large, to the towns where it is less so, necessarily meant an increase in all the virtues."

<sup>12</sup> Unlike their American cousins.

downright fraud.”<sup>13</sup> Take the question of remedies for unemployment. No economist would for an instant minimize the influence of personal inefficiency, but, as Mr. Beveridge argued before the Commission, personal character, while it largely decides the fate of individuals, is only a secondary factor in the problem of unemployment. “No physical or mental improvement would do away with the industrial forces which at present produce unemployment” (Q., 77844).

Connected with this belittling of the influence of the economic environment is the distrust of state action. So fierce is this distrust at times that one wonders whether the charity organizers are not anarchists in disguise. This reluctance to use the citizen mind in collective ways to redress wrongs and remove hindrances to the good life is, as I said, of a piece with the view that finds the origin of poverty in the inefficiency of the poor individual, which denies that it is also rooted in inequality of opportunity, in privileges vested by law in certain citizens or groups of citizens, and which therefore condemns the effort of those who would use Parliament to undo evils which Parliament has created or permitted to grow up.<sup>14</sup> But here again it is satisfactory to note that the dominant school of charity organization is being undermined *within* Denison House itself. The most striking suggestions for state interference made by the Minority are (1) the decasualization of specific trades through the compulsory use of the labor exchanges, and (2) the smoothing out of cyclical fluctuations by the compensatory action of the Government giving out saved-up contracts on the approach of

---

<sup>13</sup> Burke. Motto of a chapter on “The Working Man,” in “Chalmers on Charity,” by N. Masterman, p. 164.

<sup>14</sup> “But to transfer the wealth of one class to another by taxation or otherwise is no solution of social difficulty. The transfer is, and must be, in the nature of an alms, an *annona*; and it cannot but weaken effort instead of strengthening it. The evidence that it can have an opposite effect, it is not too much to say, is *nil*.” Loch, “Charity and Social Life,” p. 387.

trade depression. "This," if I may borrow Dr. Bosanquet's words, "is what needs all the resources of civilization; all its powers of adjustment, of contrivance, of *self-restraint*." It is an immensely difficult enterprise, but if successful is there any one project to be compared with it in its potency for preventing degradation? The Majority are lukewarm about it, and Dr. Loch seems to have confused it with the creation of relief works and therefore dismissed it as a palliative. One is unfeignedly glad to find Mr. C. J. Hamilton, the C. O. S. Lecturer in Economics, "inclined to disagree with the argument that the regularization in the demand for labor, through the device of a Government program in regard to its own work, was artificial and a mere palliative. In his opinion such a demand could take place quite naturally and without evil effect, so long as the work was not dealt with except upon ordinary economic principles."<sup>15</sup>

3. I commenced this prolonged rejoinder with a recognition of the good works of the C. O. S. I am inclined to conclude it with a suggestion for extending its influence. "The spirit of pauperism," Dr. Bosanquet tells us, "may be found in all social classes, and means a weakness of the citizen mind which prevents it from being equal to the situation. In other words, it is a defective participation in the social mind, on which the adjustment of life to social standards depends." For the last forty years the C. O. S. has addressed itself to the pauperism of the poor. It has invented the case paper and a technique of personal help. May I suggest that it should now devote itself to improving the condition of these pauper-employers who are guilty of 'habitual social misjudgment' and who are not 'equal to the situation'? Let there be begun a new series of "Occasional Papers" directed to the heads of jam, tea, match, rope and rag factories in the metropolis and to the ship-owners and stevedores of our seaports who have failed to control circumstances in the degree

---

<sup>15</sup> C. O. S. Review, July, 1909, pp. 83, 96.

which the social standard demands. Let them be bidden to exercise thrift and foresight in the use of boys and girls. Let there be drafted a new case paper for the inefficient manager and full particulars be taken down of the factory hours of work, regularity of employment, rates of pay, sanitary conditions, system of training youth, degree of coöperation with the labor exchange, and employer's use of his leisure time. Let the trade unions be invited to subscribe funds wherewith to send the hopeful cases to a model factory for training. The 'unhelpables' should be committed to a detention colony or they might be profitably emigrated at the expense of the state.

The C. O. S. preaches a gospel of ordered and responsible charity. It summons the young officers of the Guards to visit the poor and teach them the right use of wages and thus bring them into a happy state of 'chronic thrift.' 'Not alms, but a friend' is its motto, and preached with the fine fervor of Dr. Loch it has its attractions as a field of service to the common good. It provides a clearing house for the vicarious benevolence of the rich. *Non olet.* It "may be considered a defensive policy of the middle classes, though it is far from a purely selfish policy."<sup>16</sup> At its best it heals the broken-hearted and sets free the captives of evil habit. But its preventive measures come when men and women are on the verge of legal pauperism. It does not challenge boldly the mischievous politico-economic forces which are beyond the control of the poor *because* they are poor and ignorant and inefficient. It denounces 'the poverty line,' but it substitutes a charity line with visitors on the one side, and the visited on the other. We venture to suggest that an organized attack upon disease, unemployment, and bad housing will issue in more genuine neighborliness and helpful spontaneous friendships among the people themselves than will all the 'vagrant knight-errantry' of young officers of the Guards however humble, judicious, and devoted.

---

<sup>16</sup> Dr. James Bonar, P. L. C., Appendix, Vol. III, p. 211.

What the poor need most from the well-to-do and cultured classes is not more neighborliness, but better citizenship; not so much an altruism of volunteer personal service, as an income altruism that will create more favorable conditions of living.<sup>17</sup>

One came sooner or later to the time when one had to take down one's own case,—one's own shortcomings and failures. . . . These poorer neighbors might be partly of our own making.<sup>18</sup>

There is much in the proposals of the Minority about which I cannot be sanguine. I do not hope much, for example, from 'training and maintenance' for adult men and women. But the Minority do appeal to us in our collective capacity to strain ourselves to the utmost in the great enterprises of fighting disease at its source and of regularizing employment. If this part of its program could, in any substantial degree, be realized, I believe we should liberate resources of character and intelligence greater beyond all question than the encroachment it involves upon the liberty of the patient and the employer.

THOMAS JONES.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, BELFAST.

---

## GOETHE'S INFLUENCE ON CARLYLE.

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

### I.

OF all the friendships between great men none has a more peculiar and touching beauty than the friendship between Goethe and Carlyle, between the old, serene philosopher and poet, the honored genius of the gracious little Court at Weimar, and the young, unknown, stormy-hearted prophet of the North, sprung from peasants and a Puritan to the core.

That Goethe's influence upon Carlyle was deep and abiding there can be no doubt: but it is not altogether

---

<sup>17</sup> Professor Patten.

<sup>18</sup> W. G. Martley.